

¹ Orr styles his pleading as a “MOTION FOR JUDICIAL RELIEF NEW DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE 60(B)(6).” The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide a vehicle by which a defendant may challenge his criminal judgment. *See United States v. Mosavi*, 138 F.3d 1365, 1366 (11th Cir. 1998). Therefore, Rule 60(b)(6) provides no authority under which Orr may seek relief directly from the criminal judgment.

May 19, 2004), *appeal dismissed*, 114 F. App'x 579 (4th Cir. 2004) (unpublished).

Because Orr offers no indication that he has obtained certification from the court of appeals to file a second or successive § 2255 motion,² I must dismiss Orr's current action without prejudice.

A separate Final Order will be entered herewith.

DATED: March 23, 2012

/s/ James P. Jones
United States District Judge

² Orr asserts that his current claim is based on newly discovered evidence about the monetary value of a firearm on which Orr's sentence was enhanced. Newly discovered evidence is not a ground on which this court may sidestep the successive petition bar in § 2255(h).